

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 FAR 52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provision may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this address: www.arnet.gov

FAR Reference	Title	Date
52.232-15	Progress Payments Not Included	APR1984

M.2 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR AWARD OF CONTRACTS

(a) The evaluation process to be utilized in this acquisition will be the "Tradeoff Process" with the predominant consideration being award of multiple contracts to the responsible offerors whose offer provides the "Best Value" to the Government (i.e., is most advantageous to the Government; technical, price and other factors listed below considered) in accordance with FAR Part 15.101-1. The "Tradeoff Process" could involve award to other than the lowest priced offeror or to other than the highest technically rated offeror. It permits tradeoffs among price and non- price evaluation factors. In making this comparison the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical/management features than with making an award at the lowest overall price to the Government.

(b) The evaluation of the written technical proposal will be performed in accordance with the methodology and the technical evaluation criteria set forth in this Section M to determine the offeror's ability to complete all technical requirements for conducting the proposed effort.

(c) The business proposal will be analyzed and evaluated to determine the reasonableness and the realism of the proposed price and to assess any degree of performance risk in the business proposal. The purpose of this price realism analysis will be to determine if the offeror's proposed price reflects the offeror's understanding of the Government's requirements is realistic and if the proposed price is consistent with the various elements of the offeror's technical proposal.

(d) Selection will be made in accordance with the guidelines of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.3, Source Selection. Selection will be made to that responsible offeror(s) whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to the Government based on technical merit, evaluated price and other factors specified in this solicitation.

(e) The methodology to be followed in the evaluation of the written technical proposal will be the application of the technical criteria set forth in Section M below. The evaluation will produce an adjectival rating for each offeror based upon the information contained in the proposals. Therefore, the written technical proposal shall provide all information necessary to properly evaluate the proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria. An offeror should not assume that the Contracting Officer will independently obtain information necessary to evaluate its proposal and should therefore supply all information required to evaluate its proposal. Failure to provide the information required to evaluate a proposal may result in rejection of the proposal as being technically unacceptable, a finding that the proposal is excluded from the competitive range, or otherwise being downgraded.

(f) The Offeror will be evaluated on their past performance. (The information must be clear whether the work by the offeror was done as a prime contractor or a subcontractor). Offerors who describe similar contracts and subcontracts shall provide a detailed explanation demonstrating the similarity of the contracts to the requirements of the RFP. In accordance with FAR 9.104-1, General standards, the Offeror must have a satisfactory performance record in order to be considered for award. See also FAR 9.104-3(b), Satisfactory Performance Record, and FAR 42.15, Contractor Performance Information.

M.3 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Evaluation Criteria

The following evaluation criteria listed below, with relative ratings (see rating definitions) assigned to each criterion as indicated, will be applied to the technical evaluation of each proposal.

<u>Standard</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
<u>Excellent</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Approach should result in superior attainment of one or more requirements or objectives and attainment of all major requirements and objectives;</u> • <u>Approach has one or more strengths, no more than 2 weaknesses, no significant weaknesses or deficiencies and;</u> • <u>Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low</u> • <u>Award can be made without discussion</u>
<u>Acceptable</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Approach should result in attainment of all major requirements and objectives;</u> • <u>Approach may have strengths, weaknesses, no more than 2 significant weaknesses, no deficiencies; and</u> • <u>Risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate</u> • <u>Award can be made with or without discussions</u>
<u>Unacceptable</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Approach would result in unlikely attainment of one or more major requirements or objectives;</u> • <u>Approach may have strengths, weaknesses, more than 2 significant weaknesses or has deficiencies(s) that may or may not be the result of multiple significant weaknesses and;</u> • <u>Risk of unsuccessful performance is high</u> • <u>No award will be made</u>

ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The following “go no go” criteria have been established to identify organizations most suited to effectively complete the tasks included in the Statement of Work. (NOTE: Go-No-Go capability reviews will be evaluated first. If an offeror meets the capability criteria, the proposal will move on

to the technical evaluation process noted below. If not, the offeror's submission will not move on to further consideration and will not be eligible for award).

In order to meet the intent of federal code PPACA Section 3021, the model approved for the implementation of this activity calls for direct contracting with organizations that fulfill the following organizational requirements:

- Organizations that are national, regional, or state association of hospitals as identified through an organizational charter or agreement and a governing body that represents affiliated members.
- Organizations that function as national affinity organization that represent hospitals which address specific patient and/or regional health issues identified through an organizational charter or agreement and a governing body that represents affiliated members.
- Organizations that hold corporate ownership and operational control of a hospital chain of at least 25 hospitals.

Additionally, these organizations must demonstrate the existing capacity-through their own organization and through relationships with other organizations- to collect, track, and monitor hospital quality data and systems in place to support such activities relative to hospitals slated to participate in the PFP. These contracts must be awarded to organizations that have the capacity to complete the contracted tasks as the prime contractor upon award. Failure to provide documentation to support this organizational requirement will remove a proposal from further consideration for this procurement.

THE FOLLOWING EVALUATION FACTORS ARE LISTED IN DESCENDING ORDER OF IMPORTANCE:

FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The offeror shall make a clear and concise presentation of the technical approaches to accomplish each area of concentration outlined in the Statement of Work. The proposal shall demonstrate a substantive understanding of the scope, complexity and requirements associated with the project described in the Statement of Work. In addition, the offeror shall provide sufficient detail to indicate a technical understanding of, and capability for, performing all the aspect of the SOW.

The Government will evaluate the offeror's technical approach for the overall effort, challenges and obstacles through the offeror's proposed implementation plan and strategy for hospital engagement efforts in the area of the PFP. Offerors are advised to be specific in sharing the skill mix of personnel involved in the plan, timelines in relation to the various activities under the plan, and the manner in which the offeror will be able to meet the requirements of the SOW through its plan (e.g., webinars, face-to-face meetings, incentives for hospital participation...) The Government will evaluate any security plans, if the vendor does not have a need to submit one, none will be evaluated.

The government will also consider in an effort to determine best value the following factors such as geographic diversity, demographics of population being served, and settings (i.e. rural versus urban settings). This list is not all inclusive, but factors such as these will be considered by the Contracting Officer in making a final best value determination.

FACTOR 2: KEY PERSONNEL/STAFF/PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

The evaluation will assess the proposed Key Personnel, support staffs', and consultants' relevant experience and qualifications for conducting the work described in the Statement of Work, including their expertise, education, experience, qualifications and training.

Staffing Plan/Skill Mix – CMS will evaluate the Offeror's proposed personnel to be engaged in accomplishing the requirements of the SOW. The evaluation will include the types of personnel (skill mix) proposed by the Offeror, educational background, professional experience, and special qualifications that directly relate to the requirements of the SOW. This includes any key personnel, staff, and subcontractors proposed by the Offeror to ensure that the proposed labor mix accurately reflects the Offeror's technical approach.

Resumes - CMS will evaluate the quality, experience and extent of the qualifications of the Offeror's proposed key personnel based on a review of the resumes and letters of commitment submitted against the Statement of Work requirements.

The offeror must identify the overall Project Director and Key personnel with related experience in which it is proposing to accomplish the work outlined in the Statement of Work. Each Key Personnel proposed by the offeror shall indicate whether the person is:

- Currently employed by the offeror;
- A planned hire;
- Subcontractor; or
- Any other arrangement.

For persons who would be under "other arrangement" or "a planned hire" the offeror must provide documentation detailing the type of commitment (such as promissory letter) for each person.

The offeror shall describe a management structure that provides a clear chain of responsibility, quality assurance monitoring, cost control, contract administration, and adequate, qualified staff resources. Of importance in evaluating project management will be the offeror's plan to ensure that:

- Key personnel assigned to contract are not over-extended heading other efforts;
- Key personnel provide the proposed commitment for successful and timely performance of this requirement; and
- The offeror's process for advising the Government of any problems in regard to the commitment of assigned key personnel and its proposed corrective action.

FACTOR 3: MANAGEMENT AND CAPACITY

The response shall demonstrate the offeror's ability to manage all aspects of the proposed efforts including technical performance, time and delivery constraints, cost, status reporting, and subcontractor(s). Ability to identify, address, resolve and communicate problems (including conflict of interest), and to maintain appositve working relationship with CMS staff are important. The contractor (including subcontractors) has appropriate and sufficient procedures and facilities to protect proprietary and confidential data and analysis related to this SOW.

FACTOR 4: PAST PERFORMANCE

CMS will evaluate the Offeror's and proposed significant subcontractor(s) past performance information (See submission for definitions of relevant and significant subcontractor), which is expected to demonstrate the likelihood that the prospective contract will be performed successfully.

The Offeror is advised that the Contracting Officer, using prudent business judgment, may consider Federal contract past performance to be more relevant than State Agencies, Local Government or Commercial Customer performance assessments. The CO reserves the right to

limit its review of past performance information to what he/she has been determined to be relevant.

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for which information on past performance is not available, the Offeror's Past Performance may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

FACTOR 5: BUSINESS PROPOSAL

CMS will evaluate the business proposal to assess CMS' level of confidence in the offeror's ability to deliver efficient, risk free performance at a fair and reasonable cost.

The Government will assess the realistic nature of the proposed price and any information submitted in response to the business proposal in order to determine a fair and reasonable price.

M.4 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR AWARD OF CONTRACTS (JULY 2014)

1. Conflict of Interest submissions will be reviewed in accordance with contract section H.1 and Section L. Part IV of this solicitation. The Government will review the Offeror's organizational conflict of interest/personal conflict of interest (OCI/PCI) disclosure submission as submitted and make a determination if the Offeror meets the OCI/PCI requirements. CMS will not enter into a contract with an entity that CMS determines has, or has the potential for, an unresolved OCI/PCI unless CMS determines that the risk can be sufficiently mitigated. If the Contracting Officer determines an OCI/PCI exists, the Offeror will be informed of the conflict and be provided an opportunity to submit clarifications and mitigation strategy before the final best value determination is made. Additionally, the Contracting Officer may use other information besides that disclosed by the offeror in its evaluation of conflicts of interest.
2. If the Offeror is determined to be the apparently successful offeror, but a conflict of interest is determined to exist that cannot be avoided or mitigated, the Contracting Officer shall notify the offeror, provide the reasons therefor, and allow the offeror a reasonable opportunity to respond.
3. In cases where conflicts of interest cannot be avoided or mitigated satisfactorily, the Contracting Officer may preclude the offeror from consideration for contract award.
4. If the Contracting Officer finds that it is in the best interest of the United States to award the contract, notwithstanding an unresolved conflict of interest, a request for waiver for the remaining degree of Government business risks shall be requested by the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 9.503. Procurement integrity risk may not be waived.